

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-18 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1-17 are amended to clarify recited subject matter and claim 18 is added. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the following.

**I. REPLY TO REJECTIONS**

A. 35 U.S.C. § 102

On page 2, item 1 of the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 4, 6-9, 11-14, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,848,152 to Slipy et al. (hereinafter "Slipy"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

1. Claims 1, 3 and 4

Claim 1 calls for a mobile telephone comprising an interchangeable button cover interface which is configured to allow multiple different types of button covers to detachably couple with the body.

Slipy discloses a mobile telephone and cover assembly wherein the entire face plate covering the entire top side of the telephone can be replaced. Slipy explicitly discloses that the entire faceplate 104 is removably attached to the housing 102 (col. 5, lines 66-67, Figs. 1-3). Slipy's removable faceplate 104 includes a plurality of apertures 158 that allow the buttons 108 of the keypad to protrude through the faceplate. There is also a lens aperture to allow the

display screen 126 to protrude through the faceplate. There is also an earcup covering the earpiece 112 of the telephone. Slipy also discloses, in Figures 8-14, an embodiment with a faceplate 404 having a flip cover 418 that optionally covers the keys 108 of the keypad. (col. 8, lines 13-18, Figs. 8-9). However, this embodiment still has a faceplate that covers the entire top surface of the telephone.

In the Slipy reference, the entire faceplate covering the entire front of the telephone is being replaced. According to Slipy, replacing the entire faceplate allows a customer, a manufacturer or distributors and retailers to customize the same basic telephone in multiple different ways to provide cell phones with distinctive appearances (col. 1, lines 38, through 45). the customized cell phones have such different appearances because the faceplate covers the earpiece interface 112, the display 114, the keypad 116, and the microphone interface 118 (col. 4, lines 14-21). Therefore, to maximize the distinctive appearance of the cell phone, the entire faceplate must be varied (col. 4, lines 22-24).

Slipy fails to disclose or suggest replacing anything other than the entire faceplate. Slipy does disclose a flip-type keypad cover which allows the cell phone to be disabled when the keypad cover is closed (col. 2, lines 22-30). However, as shown in Figs. 8-9, the keypad cover 418 is part of the face plate 404, which is removable. Therefore, such does not deviate from the thrust of Slipy's invention of replacing the entire faceplate 404.

Slipy fails to disclose or suggest a telephone having an interchangeable button cover interface which is configured to allow multiple different types of button covers to detachably couple with the telephone body, as recited in claim 1. A device as recited in claim 1 allows the user to change just the type of keypad cover being used, as opposed to the entire faceplate. For at least this reason, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over Slipy. Claims 3-4, which depend from claim 1, are likewise patentable over the applied reference for at least the reasons discussed above and for the additional features they recite.

2. Claims 6-9 and 11

Claim 6 recites an interchangeable button cover for a mobile telephone body. Claim 6 recites a button cover configured to cover substantially only a plurality of buttons on a mobile telephone body, and an attachment device disposed on said button cover and configured to removably attach said cover to a mobile telephone body.

As explained above, the Slipy reference fails to disclose or suggest a mobile telephone having an interchangeable button cover which is configured to cover substantially only a plurality of buttons on a mobile telephone body. Instead, the interchangeable faceplates 104 of the Slipy reference cover the entire top surface of the telephone body. For at least this reason, it is respectfully submitted that claim 6 is also allowable over Slipy. Claims 7-9 and 11 depend from claim 6 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

3. Claims 12-14, 16 and 17

Claim 12 recites a mobile telephone that includes a telephone body, a plurality of grooves disposed in the telephone body, and an interchangeable button cover. Claim 12 recites that the interchangeable button cover is configured to cover substantially only a plurality of key buttons on the telephone body. Claim 12 further recites that an attachment device disposed on the button cover is configured to removably engage the plurality of grooves on the telephone body.

As explained above, Slipy fails to disclose or suggest an interchangeable button cover which is configured to cover substantially only a plurality of key buttons on a telephone body. For at least this reason, it is respectfully submitted that claim 12 is allowable. Claims 13, 14, 16, 17 are allowable for at least the same reasons, and for the additional features they recite.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, 6-9, 11-14, 16 and 17 is respectfully requested.

B. 35 U.S.C. § 103

On page 3, item 5 of the Office Action, claims 2, 5, 10 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Slipy. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Slipy neither discloses or suggests all of the features of claim 1, from which claims 2 and 5 depend, claim 6, from which claim 10 depends, and claim 12, from which claim 15 depends. Consequently, claims 2, 5, 10 and 15 are patentable over the applied reference

Serial No. 09/920,827  
Amdt. dated December 15, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of September 15, 2004

Docket No. HI-0038

for at least the reasons discussed above and for the additional features they recite. In addition, each of these dependent claims recite elements of a sliding type button cover. Slipy fails to provide any motivation or suggestion for converting its faceplates 104 into a sliding type button cover. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

## **II. NEW CLAIM 18**

By this Amendment, claim 18 is added. Claim 18 depends from claim 1 and is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above, and for the additional features it recites.

## **III. CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **Seth S. Kim**, at the telephone number listed below.

Serial No. 09/920,827  
Amdt. dated December 15, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of September 15, 2004

Docket No. HI-0038

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



John C. Eisenhart  
Registration No. 38,128  
Seth S. Kim  
Registration No. 54,577

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
(703) 766-3701 DYK/JCE/SSK:knv  
**Date: December 15, 2004**

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**

\\fk4\Documents\2019\2019-137\45562.doc